DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 055 HE 008 447

AUTHOR	Crossland, Fred E.
TITLE	Equality, Equity or Equilibrium. Policy toward Access to Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	IIE-8
PUB DATE	Sep 76
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (18th, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, March 1976)
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of International Education, Sales Division, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017 (Free)
JOURNAL CIT	Issues in International Education; n8 Sep 1976
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Opportunities; Enrollment Trends; Equal Education; *Higher Education; Institutional Role; *Manpower Development; Needs Assessment; *Open Enrollment; Student Financial Aid

ABSTRACT

The need to reexamine the elemental considerations of higher education access policies provides the background of this paper. These considerations are set in a broader social context, and some of the long-term impacts of present trends are identified. An access policy must be determined by first defining the objectives of higher education; twelve such purposes are identified. The need to examine present policies to determine if they meet these specified needs is discussed. The next step in the process is an examination of the barriers to access, such as lack of financial resources, sex, age, and racial discrimination, culturally biased entrance examinations, and physical disabilities. An evaluation of the barriers in relation to the defined purpose of higher education facilitates the decision to extend educational opportunities and, at the same time, presents some necessary changes in the education system. Trends and speculations about the future access policies and their effects on institutions and society are discussed, with the warning that access policies will have to change as our society becomes more industrialized and mechanized. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Issues in
International Education
No. 8

Equality, Equity or Equilibrium

Policy toward Access to Higher Education

by Fred E. Crossland

HE 008 442

IIE
Institute of
International
Education

Equality, Equity or Equilibrium

Policy toward Access to Higher Education

by Fred E. Crossland

Dr. Fred E. Crossland, currently a Program Officer of the Ford Foundation's Division of Higher Education and Research, is professionally concerned with a broad range of issues and problems in American higher education. Before joining the Ford Foundation, Dr. Crossland served for some 20 years as a faculty member and an administrator at New York University. He has published widely in his field and is presently engaged in a survey of current and perspective changes in American undergraduate education. His book, Minority Access to College, *was published in 1971.*

This paper was presented at the Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR), held in March 1976 in Belo Horizonte, Brazil. The agenda focused on three issues of importance to higher education institutions in the Americas: the social relevance of their academic programs; their policies regarding access; and their efforts to increase management efficiency.

The conference was financed by a major grant from the Tinker Foundation of New York, whose President, Miss Martha T. Muse, participated actively in our discussions. Supplemental funding was provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Government of Brazil. The Federal University of Minas Gerais served as host institution. We wish to express our thanks for their generous support.

James F. Tierney
Institute of International Education
New York, New York
September 1976

Anyone responsible for shaping higher education access policies is likely to become an equilibrist—that is, a tightrope walker who balances himself by assuming unnatural positions and making hazardous movements.

He must resolve the competing pressures of egalitarianism and elitism, recognize distinctions between the needs of individuals and those of society, massage the egos of academicians, serve the disadvantaged, reward the talented, be financially responsible, and maintain high academic standards. He must demonstrate a commitment to equality, even though inequalities are all about him. He must devise equitable programs and procedures, even though equity probably will exist only in the eye of the favored beholder. He must strive for equilibrium, even though he will be accused of rigidity by change advocates from all quarters.

Higher education access policies—despite, or perhaps because of, their frustrating complexity—are so fundamental that they attract widespread attention. They are lively topics of discussion in virtually every country, and engage all segments of society. Because of their importance to the future of so many people, the issues are emotion charged and arguments cliche ridden and over simplified. Accordingly, most discussions obscure rather than illuminate the elemental considerations upon which coherent and sensible long-range public policies should be based.

This paper is designed to re-examine those elemental considerations, set them in a broader social context, and identify some of the long-term impacts of present trends. It will try to acknowledge, but assuredly will fall far short of answering, the equilibrist's queries respecting equality, equity, and equilibrium.

I. Defining Higher Education's Purposes

Before deciding *who* should be encouraged or permitted to enter universities, it obviously is necessary to determine *what* higher education is all about. The policy maker should identify as many different objectives as possible and then establish priorities among them. The following sample list suggests the range and variety that is possible. Depending upon a number of circumstances, it might be argued that the primary purposes of higher education should be to:

1. train manpower to meet specific, identified needs.
2. develop a critical, discerning, and independent citizenry.
3. stimulate basic research and seek new knowledge.
4. compensate for past injustices inflicted upon certain population groups.
5. identify the most talented and prepare them for leadership roles.
6. keep young adults occupied outside the labor market.
7. encourage creative talent in the performing, visual, and literary arts.
8. propagate particular social, political, or religious values.
9. serve as an agency to reduce socioeconomic disparities.
10. protect and perpetuate the interests of the existing class structure.
11. provide unrestricted opportunity for all to achieve their potentialities.
12. contribute to rapid national development and/or self-sufficiency.

A few of these objectives would be incompatible and work at cross purposes, but most would not be mutually exclusive and probably would be reinforcing. There are various ways to categorize them. For example, some would encourage expansion of higher education systems; others would not. Some would modify the *status quo* significantly; others would inhibit change. Some would emphasize specialized education for limited purposes; others would feature general, non-career oriented education. Some would advance the primacy of society over the individual; others would do the reverse. None would satisfy everybody.

The greater the wealth of a country, the less restrictive it is obliged to be in choosing among alternative educational objectives. It may seek to embrace simultaneously a half-dozen or more goals similar to some of those suggested above, and thus avoid setting specific priorities. On the other hand, a less prosperous country probably will be required to make hard choices and concentrate on only one or two educational objectives of highest priority.

National circumstances and needs change over time, and higher education objectives quite properly should change with them. It should be noted, however, that educational processes take many years to achieve their social goals; if educational objectives are modified significantly every time there is a change in political leadership, it is unlikely that higher education would have opportunity to yield much of value.

Once the objectives are clearly defined, the basic outline of an access policy begins to take predictable shape. It soon becomes obvious that the higher education system must be designed to accommodate a specified proportion of some predetermined age group. It will become apparent that students possessing desired aptitudes, career interests, or philosophic outlooks should be favored. If there are particular population groups—the poor, the wealthy, certain minorities, the very talented, members of designated religious or political blocs, the seriously disadvantaged—that must receive special attention, appropriate policy determinations will be made quickly.

As every educational administrator knows, in the real world the process rarely works in the systematic, rational manner suggested above. The policy maker invariably must deal with a higher education system that already is in place and proceeding under its own dynamics. More likely than not, the goals toward which that system presumably is moving have never been expressed explicitly. Access to higher education probably has been determined by a series of political accommodations rather than formal policy declarations.

Nevertheless, the responsible policy maker—even if he does so only for his own personal reflection—should go through the process of making explicit a wide range of higher education objectives, and determining priorities among them. Then he should ascertain who really is securing access to higher education. The results may be surprising, for actual admission practices sometimes work counter to high-priority educational objectives. Well-intended and well-designed programs established to achieve a precise objective simply may have gone amiss.

In such circumstances, the responsible policy maker should take prompt action. Depending upon the nature of the problems faced, he should rearticulate or redefine educational goals, or modify access policies and make them compatible with established goals, or restructure admission practices so they in fact implement agreed upon access policies. All three elements—educational objectives, access policies, and admissions processes—are interdependent. They must mesh and reinforce each other in order to be effective.

II. Identifying Barriers to Access

The dominant pressure almost everywhere is to expand access to higher education. The counter-pressures ordinarily are either drowned out or discreetly muted. Since a higher education degree is a relatively scarce commodity that presumably benefits the recipient, it is not surprising that many degree holders resist expansion and that many of those without the degree want it. The latter outnumber the former, so the political pressure for increased access is obvious. As a result, much attention is focused on the barriers—both in access policy and in admissions practice—that allegedly keep certain groups of the population out of higher education. Among such barriers are the following:

1. Lack of financial resources.
2. Excessive distance from home to an institution of higher learning.
3. Sex discrimination.
4. Inadequacy of lower schools in providing academic preparation.
5. Prejudice against certain racial, religious, or political minorities.
6. Unfair, culturally biased, standardized entrance examinations.
7. Invidious counseling of students in secondary schools.
8. Physical (but not mental) disabilities that inhibit locomotion.
9. Age discrimination.
10. Undue emphasis upon communication skill requirements.

Beyond question, for a great many people these barriers are real, not fancied. The policy maker, guided by the higher education goals he has embraced, must determine precisely how each of these barriers operates, who is affected, whether or not the barrier is consistent with basic educational objectives, and the probable impact if it were to be raised or lowered. While making these determinations he also must arrive at value judgments about each barrier in regard to equity (Is it fair?), validity (Does it actually exclude only those for whom it was designed?), and appropriateness (Is it relevant to likely success in higher education?).

Each of the representative barriers in the list above invites analysis, but this paper will address only two of them—lack of financial resources and allegedly unfair entrance examinations.

One of the most fundamental policy questions concerns responsibility for paying the cost of higher education—not the cost of *providing* the education, but rather the cost of *securing* it. (The former is expense incurred by an educational institution; the latter is expense incurred by the individual student or his family. The figures ordinarily are quite different.) In most countries, some portion of the cost of *securing* a higher education is assumed by society and the remainder by the individual. The way in which those charges actually are divided significantly determines who does and who does not have access to higher education.

Arguments regarding the ideal assignment of those costs are familiar. On the one hand, it is asserted that society as a whole benefits, higher education is a right possessed by all, and hence society should pay the full cost. On the other hand, some contend that individuals are the primary beneficiaries, those educated subsequently secure substantially higher incomes, and hence individuals should pay all of their own higher education costs.

Practice in most countries falls somewhere between those extremes, and arrangements usually are made to provide some public assistance (grants, scholarships and fellowships, work opportunities, loans, and the like) to needy students. That is an interesting concept: it patently supports the idea that some portion of the cost is an individual responsibility, and then, through application of needs tests, it treats certain persons as charity cases.

It is not surprising that those at the upper end of the economic scale are over-represented in university enrollments and those at the lower end are seriously under-represented. This often invites the hasty conclusion that a direct and simple causal relationship exists, and to some degree this certainly is true. To express it negatively, for those with few or no resources the prospect of university attendance is extremely dim.

It also should be noted, however, that many affluent individuals probably possess certain characteristics—for example, persistence, ambition, self-assurance, resourcefulness, and the capacity to work effectively with others—that may have enabled them to attain and maintain a high economic status in the first place. These also happen to be the attributes that very likely would lead them to seek, and to succeed in, higher education. Thus, wealth and university attendance indeed may be linked—not necessarily because the former is the cause of the latter, but because they both happen to have common causes.

This point is important because some naive advocates of greatly expanded educational opportunity mistakenly assume that if all financial barriers could be removed, higher education enrollments automatically would be undistorted reflections of the total society. That is not to say, however, that strenuous efforts to remove financial barriers should not be made. Simple equity demands it. After all, the economic status of the typical person at the age of entry into higher education is not the result of his own doing, but rather of the accident of birth and the affluence or poverty of his forebears.

Important as financial limitations may be in restricting access, the lowering or removal of that one barrier—or of any other single barrier—probably will not have serious impact. It is the interplay of many reinforcing factors that inhibits enrollments. The policy maker who seeks to expand participation in higher education must move on many fronts simultaneously.

Perhaps the most complex and most misunderstood of all the barriers is reliance upon widely administered, standardized entrance examinations. Interestingly, they first came into widespread use because they reportedly were objective measures of academic aptitude, were graded impartially, and were reasonably reliable predictors of academic performance. Now they are subject to increasing criticism because they allegedly are culturally biased, unfair, self-fulfilling, and subject to gross misinterpretation. The high-blown rhetoric from both test defenders and critics must be stripped away in order to deal with this issue.

There probably are only two basic and valid reasons for having any examinations at the point of entry to higher education. In the first instance, if there are more candidates than available spaces, tests can be screening devices to determine who shall be permitted to enter. In the second case, if there is no need for an entrance sieve, tests may be employed for diagnostic

and placement purposes—that is, to identify student accomplishments and deficiencies, and to indicate appropriate curricula, courses, or remediation. It is the former use that attracts public attention and criticism.

Most of the time, most societies appear to agree that higher education should be for "the most able." Rarely is it clear, however, what is meant by "ability." Obviously there are many different kinds of skills and aptitudes, and they may not be equally important or relevant in determining the likelihood of success in higher education. Furthermore, even if the requisite abilities are identified, isolated, and evaluated, a testing instrument may not actually be measuring the right thing. Despite these and other problems, entrance examinations for higher education now are employed widely, and virtually all of them have these three things in common:

1. They measure and attach high importance to verbal ability. This seems reasonable because practically all learning activity relies heavily upon reading, writing, speaking, and listening with comprehension.

2. Test scores are reported on a relative scale. This too seems reasonable because there are no known absolutes of ignorance or wisdom, and hence it appears logical to rank those who are tested.

3. The abilities and skills that tests purport to measure are distributed throughout the tested population according to the familiar bell curve.

These three test characteristics themselves often are the subject of criticism. Some individuals with other highly developed skills—musical talent, manual dexterity, physical coordination, or creativity, to cite a few examples among many—deplore the emphasis upon communication skills and declare it to be unfair. There are numerous complaints about the process of rank-ordering which inexorably classifies half of all test-takers as "below average." Some argue that individuals should not be pitted against each other, but should be tested only against their own prior performances.

Critics often question the predictive value of tests, and sometimes generalize from exceptions and cite "low-scorers" who attain scholastic eminence. In fact, test scores and rankings merely indicate probabilities based upon empirical evidence, and testers' evaluations and predictions for population groups (rather than for individual persons) within measured ability ranges are remarkably on target. Psychometricians argue that their tests are no more responsible for inequitable distribution of academic skills than is the thermometer responsible for fluctuations in temperature. They both just measure what is, but they don't create it.

More often than not, tests are blamed for circumstances they did not create. If educational policy makers determine that only some limited proportion of a country's youth shall enter higher education, exclusionary devices inevitably must be employed. Even if it is "first come-first served," some will arrive after the gates have been closed. The tardy ones will find reasons for questioning the fairness of that procedure. This is a circumstance which inevitably must be faced, and the policy maker must be prepared for such reactions wherever higher education demand exceeds the capacity of the system.

All of the foregoing is not intended to suggest that admission tests for higher education are infallible or that they cannot be manipulated for devious reasons. In his search for equity, the policy maker should be vigilant to be sure that tests actually measure what they purport to measure, that they are administered under secure and appropriate conditions, that individual test questions are not so phrased as to unfairly discriminate on irrelevant or non-educational bases, that those who interpret tests and take subsequent actions based upon test scores perform their functions properly, and that such interpretations and actions be subject to modification as circumstances change. He must recognize that certain skills and personality characteristics probably are necessary for successful test-taking, that those who have had considerable prior experience in taking such examinations have an advantage, and that he should find ways to compensate for those facts. The policy maker should make every effort to ensure that neither fellow educators nor the general public misinterpret the purposes, overstate the utility, or attach undue significance to test results.

III. Extending Opportunities

If it is decided, for whatever reasons, that higher education opportunities should be equalized and access extended to a larger proportion of the population, a number of related steps must be taken. Determination as to which actions to take in what order will depend upon special circumstances peculiar to the country and the specific reasons for the policy decision to expand higher education.

At the outset, many or all of the access barriers listed in the previous section of this paper should be examined carefully and necessary changes made. In addition, policy makers should consider many other possibilities, recognizing that the impact of expanded access extends throughout the higher education system and requires a great many adjustments. Examples abound, and the following merely are representative. If access policies are changed and educational opportunity is extended to large numbers of people hitherto excluded from higher education, it may be necessary to:

1. recognize significant differences in individual learning styles and encourage many different pedagogical modes.
2. expand the curriculum to accommodate new career objectives not earlier considered suitable for university study.
3. consider the limitations of the academic calendar, and perhaps provide greater flexibility in the time required to complete a degree.
4. make a choice between expanding existing institutions or establishing new ones.
5. devise new organizational structures and techniques to manage the larger enterprise.
6. decide whether to create a diversified higher education system consisting of special-purpose institutions, or to support comprehensive, multi-purpose universities.
7. establish programs to train the larger faculty and administrative cadre that undoubtedly will be required.

Implicit in most of the foregoing statements is the assumption that extending access essentially means increasing the number of incoming students from the typical age group to pursue typical curricula at typical institutions. Such need not be the case.

Expanded access could mean new educational opportunities for adults of all ages. By making use of modern technology, new educational delivery systems might be employed to provide instruction at home, in the factories, or on the farm to formerly unserved populations. New attention might be given to programs for part-time students, to those wishing to pursue independent study, to those who might have only limited educational goals and do not wish to secure a degree. Possibilities abound for the innovative educator.

Three points merit emphasis. First, the act of extending access to higher education will have immediate impact upon the total educational system. Entry into higher education is but one step in a continuum; significant changes at that point have major bearing on elementary and secondary education, as well as on the substance and structure of higher education itself.

Second, the extension of access to higher education provides opportunity—to be welcomed by some but feared by others—to do far more than merely increase the size of the enterprise along traditional lines. Radical changes are possible in virtually all aspects of higher education. The astute policy maker will recognize the implications of, the constraints imposed by, and the opportunities that accompany expanded access.

Third, once the process of expanding access to higher education is under way, social and political pressures will make it extraordinarily difficult to reverse that trend. When society's expectations have been raised and its appetite whetted, contraction of the higher education system becomes almost unthinkable.

IV. Speculating About the Future

Some romantic academics may choose to believe otherwise, but higher education never was, is not now, and probably never will become an end in itself; it is a means to achieve certain ends. Its purposes may be many and varied, but essentially they are utilitarian. Sterile arguments about the relative merits of vocational training as opposed to the liberal arts miss the point: the critical fact is that higher education purports to "produce" people who in some way are "different," and maybe even "better," as a result of that experience.

The difference may be in the acquisition of specific skills, the development of general problem-solving abilities, the emergence of new aesthetic sensitivities, new attitudes about self and others, or any number of other measures. Each may be important in its own terms, for its own purposes. Formal education by no means is the only agency yielding these results, but educational institutions insist upon taking the lion's share of credit. Some of those alleged results of the educational process may be vocational in application and some avocational; most could be both.

The following discussion seeks to close the circle, for it redirects attention to issues raised in the first section of this paper, "Defining Higher Education's Purposes." Proceeding from the hypotheses expressed in the two foregoing paragraphs, the following questions are posed: How and why did higher education come to assume its current importance? Are present trends likely to change? If so, when and in what ways?

The basic historical facts are well known, but they bear repeating. For centuries there have been persistent world-wide

pressures to industrialize and mechanize. Despite the legitimate concerns of ecologists and others worried about diminishing natural resources, this pattern probably will continue for some time. Ostensibly, these actions have been taken to increase production, minimize costs, maximize profits, and reduce dependence upon human labor. The pattern has not been limited to large-scale manufacturing and processing; increasingly, gadgets and small-scale household appliances have become accepted trappings of daily living. The overwhelming majority of inventions and scientific discoveries have resulted in substitutes for human energy, a substitution that most people label "progress."

This has been, with few exceptions, a pattern that has affected all countries. Indeed, there is temptation to classify nations as more or less developed according to the degree to which they have become industrialized and mechanized. And again with few exceptions, virtually all of the less developed countries seek to emulate the more developed.

The more industrialized and mechanized a society, the higher the proportion of its labor force employed in service activities as opposed to manufacturing and processing. This is caused by at least three factors:

1. Large-scale industrialization frees much human labor which then can—perhaps must!—be put to other use;
2. Increasingly complicated machinery, both for production and for individual use, requires ever more servicing; and
3. Increasing national wealth, higher standards of living, and rising expectations lead people to demand increased personal services.

Note, however, that as service activities themselves grow, they too tend to become more complex and seek greater efficiencies through mechanization. Soon the economy requires servicers to service the service industries!

All this demands an increasingly skilled and sophisticated work force to make, operate, and maintain the tools of production, and to satisfy growing demands for ever more services of increased complexity. The pressures work in different ways. Those already employed seek to enhance and protect their current status. Accordingly, they are likely to insist that neophytes be subjected to extensive training and that entrance criteria for those seeking employment be demanding. Approaching it from another point of view, those doing the employing are likely to seek ways to reduce dependence upon large numbers of costly skilled workers and professionals by substituting ever more sophisticated machines. But this, in turn, requires even more skilled (but presumably fewer) workers. To the extent that employers, whether in manufacturing and processing or in service areas, require personnel with more demanding skills, they too want assurance that the new workers and professionals will be well-trained. But since such training is expensive, time consuming, and not immediately productive and profitable, employers ordinarily prefer to leave that task to someone else.

Within the past century, the apprentice system has almost disappeared. Once the primary device for producing new workers and professionals, it has been replaced almost completely by formal, institutionalized education and training that normally is removed from the factory, mine, workshop, office, or service center. This trend has proceeded so far that the education industry—and especially higher education—has gained a virtual monopoly in its three interrelated roles of screener, trainer,

and certifier of the labor force. It is precisely for this reason that access to higher education becomes ever more crucial as our societies become ever more industrialized, mechanized, and complicated. Without the requisite credentials of higher education, a growing number of career doors simply are closed to the individual.

On the face of it, simple justice and equity, as well as political expediency, would seem to require that access to higher education be extended to as many as possible, and perhaps even to all. But to do that would negate one of the three basic functions of today's university—namely, to serve as a screen or filter in the identification of those presumed to be the most talented and hence the best able to assume key positions in the labor and professional force.

In an attempt to reconcile those points, some argue that access should be unrestricted, but that internal university standards should remain high and unchanged. Thus, virtually everyone would have the opportunity to try, but presumably only the talented few would persevere and ultimately merit the university's imprimatur. Crudely put, the university would make it easy to get in, but difficult to survive and secure certification.

Whether or not such an arrangement makes sense depends upon a variety of circumstances. For one thing, it can be very expensive—both for society and for those individuals courting failure. If a country truly has severely limited financial and educational resources, it probably would not be prudent simply and suddenly to try to open the door to all; instead, those limited resources should be concentrated on the most promising candidates. In time, if and when both the resource base and the demand for skilled personnel grow, higher education could and should be expanded to provide access to larger proportions of the population.

Whether or not a country can afford unrestricted admissions, there are other considerations that should be noted. For example, it is most unlikely that any university can reduce significantly its entrance standards and still maintain its former internal academic standards. Some university faculties claim the contrary, but to assert that the former can be lowered without affecting the latter suggests that grading standards in courses of study are clearly defined and absolute. In fact, they almost certainly are not. Evidence indicates that professors' expectations of students, as well as actual performance by students, are adjusted, consciously or otherwise, to meet the ability levels of the class. (Indeed, this fact is one of the reasons that standardized, extra-mural examinations came to be used so widely to provide more objective assessments of ability.) Thus, a "lowering" of admissions standards almost certainly will lead to a subsequent lowering of internal academic standards. The issue is not whether or not this is bad; it simply questions the premise put forth by some defenders of universal, unrestricted admission.

The pressures that ordinarily lead to the inauguration of open admission policies can be expected to persist, and ultimately be translated into pressures to ensure that no student may be dismissed for academic reasons, that all may be assured promotion, and that a degree is guaranteed to every person. None of these eventualities would be calamitous, but assuredly they would change the nature of higher education; whether the change would be for better or worse depends upon one's perspective.

Perhaps the most serious indictment of a policy of totally non-selective access to higher education is the probability that it cruelly would deceive the very persons

the policy presumably is designed to help. In the name of equity, an iniquity might be perpetrated. Consider again the screening function of the university. If institutions of higher learning do not perform that function at the point of entry, all they will be doing is delaying it until a later date, when the trauma of rejection probably will be even greater.

The interplay between manpower supply and demand often is complex, but for purposes of educational planning it is reasonable to assume that supply is responsive to demand, rather than vice versa. Doubling the number of new university students does not *ipso facto* double the number of jobs and professional positions that subsequently may be available to them. It is, however, much easier for political leaders to expand university admissions than to create more jobs, so there is always the inviting temptation to do the former, take immediate political credit, and let succeeding officials worry about unemployed graduates.

The point is not to argue against expanded access to higher education. Rather, it is to warn that if our increasingly industrialized and mechanized world continues along present lines, sooner rather than later we will have to adjust radically both our perceptions of the appropriate functions of, and our policies respecting access to, higher education.

We may be working at cross purposes. On the one hand, we have designed our universities to produce producers, and we seem intent upon producing ever more of them. But on the other hand, in the name of progress and development we continually seek new ways to reduce dependence upon human labor and effort in the production of goods and services. It is sobering to consider what would happen if these two trends were to continue to their illogical conclusions. Today such prospects may seem remote to an impoverished or severely underdeveloped country, but in some of the most highly industrialized societies work rationing (unemployment is but one form!) already looms on the horizon.

These circumstances should not dismay us, for they could provide exciting challenges hitherto unknown to educators. Consider but a few possibilities. Educational emphasis could change, to a substantial degree, from producing producers to producing consumers—consumers of culture as well as consumers of goods and services. There would be less reason to have virtually all of formal education take place in the first third of the lifespan; now it is considered "prepration for life" and locked in place for most people, but that could change. True lifelong learning might be an attainable goal. As we continue to reduce demands for human labor, the amount of human discretionary time will increase. This could provide extraordinary opportunities for educational institutions (probably organized along radically new lines) to expand programs concerned with the quality of life, aesthetics, the fine arts, literature, music, the distinctiveness of the human condition, and other pursuits once reserved to a miniscule and favored minority. All these possibilities, plus others that will occur to educators prepared to spin dreams, suggest a future filled with high hope for a higher education prepared to extend access far more widely than ever before.
Under these circumstances, our policy maker need not be a frustrated equilibrist seeking delicate balance between and among equality, equity, and equilibrium. Perhaps all three could and will be achieved in a new and reshaped higher education that is about to evolve.

SUGGESTED READING FOR ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

American Council on Education, *Higher Education for Everybody? Issues and Implications.* (American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.: 1970)

Anderson, C. Arnold, Mary Jean Bowman, and Vincent Tinto, *Where Colleges Are and Who Attends: Effects of Accessibility on College Attendance.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1972)

Armitage, Peter, Cyril Smith, and Paul Alper, *Decision Models for Educational Planning.* (Allen Lane Penguin Press, London: 1969)

Ashby, Eric, *Adapting Universities to a Technological Society.* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: 1974)

Black, Hillel, *They Shall Not Pass.* (William Morrow, New York: 1963)

Bowles, Frank H., *Access to Higher Education: The International Study of University Admissions.* (UNESCO, New York: 1963)

Burn, Barbara B., *et al, Higher Education in Nine Countries.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1971)

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *New Students and New Places.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1971)

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Toward a Learning Society: Alternative Channels to Life, Work, and Service.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1973)

College Entrance Examination Board, *Barriers to Higher Education.* (College Entrance Examination Board, New York: 1971)

Crossland, Fred E., *Minority Access to College.* (Schocken Books, New York: 1971)

Hodgkinson, Harold J., *Institutions in Transition.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1971)

Knoell, Dorothy M., *People Who Need College: A Report on Students We Have Yet to Serve.* (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.: 1970)

McGrath, Earl J. (editor), *Universal Higher Education.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1966)

Medsker, Leland L., and Dale Tillery. *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-year Colleges.* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1971)

Thresher, B. Alden, *College Admission and the Public Interest.* (College Entrance Examination Board, New York: 1966)

Toffler, Alvin (editor), *Learning for Tomorrow.* (Random House, New York: 1974)

About IIE

The Institute of International Education was founded in 1919 to promote international understanding through education. It administers scholarship and fellowship programs for the U.S. and foreign governments, universities, foundations, corporations, and international organizations, and provides support services to researchers and advisers on developmental assistance projects abroad. Seeking to promote effective educational interchange, IIE offers information and consultative services through a network of offices in the U.S. and overseas and carries on an extensive schedule of seminars and workshops. IIE acts as the parent agency for the International Councils on Higher Education, which bring together U.S. and foreign university heads and other educational policy-makers in a continuing series of conferences.

Institute of International Education
809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017 (212) 883-8200

U.S. REGIONAL OFFICES

MIDWEST
65 East South Water Street/Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel. (312) 236-8232

ROCKY MOUNTAIN
Capitol Life Center
700 Broadway, Suite 112/Denver, Colorado 80203
Tel. (303) 837-0788

SOUTHEAST
1132 West Peachtree, NW/Suite 110/Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Tel. (404) 873-2851

SOUTHERN
Suite 1-A, World Trade Center
1520 Texas Avenue/Houston, Texas 77002
Tel. (713) 223-5454

WASHINGTON, D.C.
1709 New York Avenue, NW/Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel. (202) 872-9060

WEST COAST
3850 Wilshire Boulevard/Los Angeles, California 90010
Tel. (213) 387-7111

San Francisco Office
291 Geary Street/San Francisco, California 94102
Tel. (415) 362-6520

OVERSEAS OFFICES

EAST AFRICA
P.O. Box 45869, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. 26112. Cable: INTERED

MEXICO
Educational Counseling Center/Apartado Postal 88 Bis/American Embassy/Mexico 1, D.F.
Tel. (905) 566-8807. Cable: IIEMEX

SOUTH AMERICA
Apartado 300/Lima 1, Peru
Tel. 2-45011. Cable: INTERED

Branch Office at Moneda 1467, Casilla 9286/
Santiago, Chile

SOUTHEASTERN ASIA
P.O. Box 6907/Tsimshatsui, Hong Kong
Tel. 3-670125. Cable: AISFACTS

Branch Office at the National Education Commission Building, Sukhothai Road, Dusit/Bangkok, Thailand
Tel. 281-8787. Cable: INTEREDU

Issues in International Education

PREVIOUS REPORTS

Are available from IIE's Sales Division. There is a charge of $1.00 per copy for each report. Orders should be prepaid.

No. 1 – Education is Development, and Vice Versa
by Harlan Cleveland

No. 2 – The Andean Common Market
by Reynold E. Carlson

No. 3 – The Changing Role of Educational Cooperation in Asia

No. 4 – Collaboration in Science and Technology
by K. N. Rao

No. 5 – Evolving Patterns of Organization and Management in Asian Universities
by Victor M. Ordonez

CURRENT REPORTS

Are available at no charge. Please write to the Sales Division.

No. 6 – Alternatives to Traditional Medical Training in Latin America
by E. Croft Long

No. 7 – Latin American Studies: New Roles, New Constraints

No. 8 – Equality, Equity or Equilibrium
by Fred E. Crossland

IIE

Institute of International Education

809 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017